REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for reviewing the pending application. In addition, the Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to the Applicants' representatives during the February 13, 2009 in-person interview with the Examiner at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. More will be said about the in-person interview below.

Claims 1-30, 36 and 46 were previously cancelled. Claims 31-35, 37-45 and 47-59 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Beginning on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 31-35, 37-45 and 47-59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Holma *et al.* ("WCDMA for UMTS" cited in Applicant's submitted IDS) (hereinafter "*Holma*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,965,580 to Takagi *et al.* (hereinafter "*Takagi*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." The Applicant respectfully submits that the aforementioned combination of references does not teach all of the limitations set forth in claims 31-35, 37-45 and 47-59; therefore, the combination of references cannot render these claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 31 defines a method of providing a point-to-multipoint service. The method involves, among other things, "generating an identifier for indicating the point-to-multipoint service," "adding the generated identifier to a data unit," and transmitting the data unit to a mobile terminal." Neither *Holma* nor *Takagi* teach or suggest any of these features. Accordingly, the combined teaching of *Holma* and *Takagi* cannot render claim 31 obvious.

As stated above, an in-person interview was held with the Examiner on February 13, 2009. During the interview, it was agreed that the teachings of *Holma* and *Takagi*, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or otherwise suggest, "generating an identifier for indicating the point-to-multipoint service," as required by claim 31. As such, the combined teaching of *Holma* and *Takagi* must also fail to disclose "adding the generated identifier to a data unit," and "transmitting the data unit to a mobile terminal."

As discussed, and agreed to, during the interview, *Holma* actually discloses the use of an identifier which identifies a corresponding UE receiving a point-to-point service. This identifier is referred to as a U-RNTI (i.e., a radio network temporary identifier for user equipment). *Holma* does not, however, teach or suggest an MBMS RNTI or any other type of identifier that identifies the service rather than the user equipment. Also, as agreed upon during the in person interview, *Takagi* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Holma*. Accordingly, and as stated above, the combined teaching of *Holma* and*Takagi* fails to render claim 31 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Independent claim 41 recites features that are similar to those recited in claim 31. Thus, claim 41 is patentably distinguishable over the combined teaching of *Holma* and *Takagi* for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 31.

Claims 32-35, 37-40 and claims 42-45 and 47-59 variously depend from claim 31 or claim 41. Therefore, these claims are also patentably distinguishable over *Holma* in view of *Takegi* for the same reasons claims 31 and 41 are patentable. Thus, for at least these reasons, the Examiner agreed to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. See Interview Summary.

The application is in condition for allowance. Early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Office finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: March 16, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael J. Wright (Reg. No. 46,522)
for **Mark R. Kresloff**
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant